Peace education in an era of globalization

by **Prof.dr.Birgit Brock-Utne.**[1]

Lecture given at Universitat Internacional de Menorca, Spain on Friday 18 September 1998.

Introduction

We shall here look at the challenges that meet peace educators in this era of globalization. To be able to analyze what the challenges are, and how they can be met, we first need to look at the concept "globalization" itself. What do we think of when we use the word globalization or global village? Do we think about the type of market-economy that seems to have conquered the world? What type of violence does this market-economy lead to? What challenges does it pose for peace educators? Or do we look at the increased communication between people from different cultures through travels in the air, on land or in cyber-space? What does this communication mean in terms of problems, challenges and possibilities for a peace educator? Peace education as an academic field also needs to be looked into. What is peace education? How does it relate to human rights education? How does one link the micro with the macro within peace and human rights education?

What is globalization?
In many ways it has become the-buzzword of the day. In their book: "Global Village or Global Pillage" Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (1994) claim that the word "globalization" is "on the lips of politicians, professors and pundits alike". (Brecher and Costello, 1994:4) Corporations, markets, finance, banking, transportation, communication, and production more and more cut across national boundaries. This globalization of capital is being deliberately accelerated by most national governments, by international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank and by the global corporations themselves.

Many authors claim that the world has become "a global village". Economies are interconnected, computers and fax machines connect people across oceans. Millions of people all over the world have become "netizens", a new word coined to denote the inhabitants of the Internet. We surf the Internet and though most of us do not have the time our kids have to hang out online a lot, we communicate daily and swiftly around the globe, send each other articles and whole manuscripts within seconds. The netizens now number about 60 Million and are growing at a rate of 20% every year. (the European, eBit 98, 16-22 March 1998, no.408). They are, however, very unevenly distributed throughout the world.

New diseases ignore national boundaries and environmental destruction in one part of the world profoundly affects other parts of the world.

[1] **Institute for Educational Research.**
University of Oslo. P.B.1092 Blindern. 0317 Oslo. Norway.
Phones: * 47 22 85 53 95 (office) *** 47 66 91 80 36 (home)
        92 84 87 89 (cell phone)
Faxes : * 47 22 85 42 50 (office) *** 47 66 91 59 17 (home)
E-mail: birgit.brock-utne@ped.uio.no

Many of the world's medicines come from plants in numerous rain forests. In a book dealing with the increasing global inequalities York Bradshaw and Michael Wallace (1996) lament the fact that increased profit-seeking leads to deforestation and that the cure for AIDS, cancer and many other diseases may already have been deforested.

Bradshaw and Wallace (1996) find that the most striking feature of the global village may be summed up in one word: **disparity.** An effect of the globalization of capital is increased differences between the haves and the have-nots.
The share of the poorest 20 percent of the world's people in global income was 2,3% in 1960 and sunk further to 1.4% in 1991 and even further to 1.1% in 1997 according to the latest Human Development Report from UNDP. It continues to shrink. And the ratio of the income of the top 20% to that of the poorest 20 rose from 30 to 1 in 1960 to 61 to 1 in 1991 and 78 to 1 in 1994 (UNDP,1997:9). Those who suffer the most when disparities grow are both in industrialized and developing countries women and children, especially single mothers. The concept "feminization of poverty" catches this phenomenon. According to a study conducted by the American peace researcher Elise Boulding (1978) women receive more beatings in periods of high unemployment.

In the much discussed book by Hans-Peter Martin and Harald Schumann (1996): *Die Globalisierungsfalle. Der Angriff auf Demokratie und Wohlstand* (translated into several languages) the authors claim that we are heading towards a 20 - 80 percent society, a society where the great majority - 80 percent live in poverty and with hardly any decision-making power when it comes to conditions affecting their lives while 20 percent live in abundance, are always short of time and make far-reaching decisions affecting everyone.

Ulf Hannertz (1996) argues against the idea of the "global village" which to him suggests interconnectedness, togetherness and homogenization of culture. In his argument, using a transnational perspective, he emphasizes creative interpretation which results in creolization rather than homogenization, also called McDonaldization. The transnational perspective shows that individuals may live with multiple cultural and linguistic contexts without losing their identity, rather they develop transnational identities.
Ballard (1994) argues that just as individuals can be multilingual, they can also be "skilled cultural navigators" who are multicultural with the competence to behave appropriately in a number of different arenas (Ballard, 1994:31). Likewise Ulrich Beck (1997) in his book: Was ist Globalisierung? talks about "Ortspolygamie" (mit mehreren Orten verheiratet zu sein) - people who are wedded to more than one place. I have elsewhere described the experience of a cultural commuter (Brock-Utne,1994).

There is a small group of people who enjoy the benefits of a shrinking world. They are the transnationalists, the cultural commuters, "die Ortspolygame Menschen". They have a responsibility of not only enjoying the benefits but also analyzing what is happening to the majority of the population. They have a responsibility of working against a policy leading to greater disparities.

Adopting Talcott Parson's well elaborated social system theory where a social system is known to have four sub-systems, namely the economic, political, social and cultural, Piertse (1995) has summarised the manner in which each academic discipline, through focusing on certain sets of these multidimensional processes, defines globalization:
In economics, globalization is being equated with economic

internationalisation and the spread of capitalist market relations. In
international relations the focus is on the increasing density of
interstate relations, the new role of the state and the development of
global politics. In sociology the concern is with the increasing
world-wide densities and the emergence of "world society." In cultural
studies, the focus is on global communication as well as world-wide
cultural standardization as in Cocacolanization, McDonaldization or
postcolonial culture. (Piertse,1995:45)
In this essay I shall concentrate on the first and last of the
dimensions mentioned by Piertse, the economic and the cultural and how
globalization within these two sub-systems affect peace education.

What is peace education?
Peace education, like the concept peace itself, is a contested
concept.[2] It faces a lot of the same analytical problems as the peace
concept does and also meets some additional ones. The whole field of
peace education is extremely difficult to treat in a scholarly manner
because the term is open to so many different political
interpretations. For political reasons - to reach consensus on a
definition of peace education to be used in the international
community or in the official school curriculum guidelines - the term
is intentionally made to be open to various interpretations and to
accomodate various viewpoints.

The division of peace education into various subfields like human
rights education, disarmament education and development education may
be looked at as an attempt to make the unwieldly peace education field
somewhat easier to handle analytically. Roughly speaking, those who
place most emphasis on the structural violence part of the peace
concept would also like to see development education as the most
central part of peace education. In another article I have tried to
relate the concepts disarmament education, development education, and
human rights education to each other and to peace education, which I
see as the generic umbrella for all the different disciplines.(Brock-
Utne,1988). I shall also here take peace education to include
development and human rights education.

But it is fair to mention that there has been some discussion within
peace studies on the question of whether peace education is the
broadest concept also encompassing human rights education or whether
human rights education can be looked at as the broadest concept, also
encompassing peace and development issues? Some also maintain that
human rights education can be looked at as an *approach* to be applied
to the field of peace education.

There are different opinions on this question. Within the peace
education field human rights education is normally looked at as a sub-
field of peace education.

Yet the Declaration adopted at the World Conference on Human Rights in
Vienna in June 1993 looks at human rights education as an all-
embracing concept. The Declaration stresses that:

>   "Human Rights Education should include peace, democracy,
>   development and social justice, as set forth in international and
>   regional human rights instruments in order to achieve common
>   understanding and awareness with a view to strengthening universal
>   commitment to human rights...The proclamation of a United Nations

---

[2]   For a more detailed discussion of the peace education concept see Brock-
Utne,1989, p.74 - 80)

decade for human rights education in order to promote, encourage and focus these educational activities should be considered." (The Declaration from the World Conference in Vienna in 1993. Article II.d.)

This broad way of defining human rights education makes the concept overlap the peace education concept and makes it as unwieldly as that concept.

Betty Reardon, one of the leading experts on peace education in the United States has analyzed more than hundred peace curricula guides in current use in the US to-day, from Kindergarden through high school. She concludes:

> "There are as yet no clear and precise limits to, nor standards for, what is to be included in peace education.
> (Reardon,1988,:xix)

Through her analysis she identified nine topical areas that constituted the foci of contemporary peace education curricula in the United States. These areas include conflict resolution, cooperation, non-violence, multicultural understanding, human rights, social justice, world resources and global environment. All of these areas have a cognitive component as well as an attitudinal and behavioral one.

Betty Reardon defines the purpose of peace education this way:
> "The general purpose of peace education, as I understand it, is to promote the development of authentic planetary consciousness that will enable us to function as global citizens and to transform the present human condition by changing social structures and the patterns of thought that have created it.
> (Reardon,1988:x)

I have elsewhere defined peace education this way:
> "By peace education I mean the social process through which peace, as I have defined it, is achieved. This includes the practising of equality of rights and equal power-sharing for every member of a given community. It further includes the learning of skills of non-violent conflict resolution. It also includes respect for human rights.". (Brock-Utne,1985:73)

In another article Betty Reardon (1997) claims that the essential contribution human rights can make to peace education is to provide the basis for a prescriptive, holistic yet particularized approach that, "would make peace education not only more comprehensive but also far more comprehensible" (Reardon,1997:22) The conceptual core of peace education, according to Betty Reardon, is violence, its control, reduction, and elimination. The conceptual core of human rights education is, as she sees it, human dignity, its recognition, fulfillment and universalization.

From micro to macro or: Are women's rights human rights?
The Norwegian educational researcher Tone Skinningsrud (1982) who has looked at the similarity in strategies for eliminating class, gender and ethnic differences in education concludes that the failure to see that patterns of dominance which prevail in society at large are repeated in micro-settings like the class-room can account for the failure to be successful in obtaining equality between the sexes, between social classes and between ethnic groups by various reforms of integration. Any reform which does not take into account the power play between the macro and micro level, between the dominant and the dominated is likely to fail. Research has shown both with regard to

gender, class and ethnicity that merely bringing pupils together in the class-room does not bring about the mutual understanding and equality of resource allocation which ideally has been intended.

I have elsewhere tried to link the nicro and the macro in peace and development studies. (Brock-Utne,1997) I try to show that interpersonal and global violence is connected, an understanding that especially feminist peace researchers have brought to the field of peace studies.

In another chapter in the same book Riane Eisler (1997) examines the relationship between violence and abuse in intimate relations and human rights violations in all spheres of life. She also argues that this is a missing link in human rights theory as well as in most analyses of social violence.
Eisler introduces an integrated approach to human rights that looks at interrelationships between private and public spheres. She documents how in its parent-child and gender relations the family has often socialized people to accept human rights violations as normal. Instead of classifying gender relations as peripheral women's isues, Eisler views these relations as a fundamental building block for *all* human relations. We can see this connection by looking at regimes known for their human rights violations: they also try to force women into subservience.

As far as I can see it, all of the six cells are logically independent of one another. It is for instance possible that a man may keep his wife in ignorance, locked up in the house, not allowed to read or watch television in a country where the right to free communication is widely enjoyed. Likewise there may be war in a country and no wife battering or wife battering and no war. It is important to be aware of this logical independence when one does research on one or more of the cells, an independence which is frequently not recognized by the United Nation consensus texts on peace. Here peace is often taken to mean "the absence of war" in one paragraph whereas in the next paragraph it is said that peace cannot exist without the full participation of everyone in decision-making, the enjoyment of human rights, equality and so on.

But the logical independence of the cells does not mean that there cannot be some connections between the cells, indeed there may be many. Whether such connections exist, is an empirical question. As mentioned feminist scholarship like that of Elise Boulding (1978) has shown that women receive more beatings in periods of high unemployment, thus linking unorganized direct violence on the micro-level to organized structural violence on the macro level. In the same study Elise Bouding finds that women feel themselves especially menaced when the level of general violence increase because of the strong psychological nexus between violence and rape.

In periods of war women are not only tortured and slaughtered like men are but it is common practice that they are raped. Susan Brownmiller (1975) has shown that selective reporting of rape has provided an ideological excuse for men to rape women "belonging" to other men.

For each of the six cells research questions may be asked of particular relevance for women and from one or more of the six feminist perspectives I have outlined elsewhere,(Brock-Utne,1989, pp.14-39), theoretically making for thirty-six combinations. One or more of the cells may attract more interest and attention from a researcher using one of the feminist perspectives for her or his analysis than from a researcher using one of the other perspectives.

Only when we have gathered a vast amount of studies pertaining to all of the six cells and from various feminist perspectives shall we have given a complete feminist analysis of peace, an analysis which will widen the field and give it greater objectivity, that is seeing more sides of the problem.

In a study of the final documents from the three UN Women Decade conferences (Mexico,1975, Copenhagen,1980 and Nairobi,1985) I have shown how the peace concept has changed within these same types of UN documents through the decade to include in it also the absence of violence against women (Brock-Utne,1988b). In this analysis I have shown that the only one of the final documents which stresses the feminist insight of linking micro with macro and stating that there is no peace as long as women are being beaten and mutilated is the Nairobi document (Brock-Utne,1986 and Brock-Utne,1989, p.70-73) Here it says in paragraph 258:

"Violence against women exists in various forms in everyday life in all societies. Women are being beaten, mutilated, burned, sexually abused and raped. Such violence is a major obstacle to the achievement of peace.

And in paragraph 257 we find the following sentences:

"The question of women and peace and the meaning of peace for women cannot be separated from the broader question of relationships between women and men in spheres in life and in the family. Discriminatory practices and negative attitudes towards women should be eliminated and traditional gender norms changed to enhance women's participation in peace."(paragraph 257)

The change in the peace concept from the 1980 to the 1985 conferences reflects some of the thinking going on within the net-work of feminist peace researchers within the International Peace Research Association (IPRA). This group, which was started in Orilla, Canada in 1981, exerted both by direct and commissioned consultancy and more indirect lobbying a great influence on the redefinition of the peace concept to include the absence of violence at the micro-level, especially against women.

In an article on education on the human rights of women as a vehicle for change the Polish lawyer Dorota Gierycs who is a Social Affairs Officer from the Sustainable Development and Policy Coordination unit of the United Nations writes:

"The extent of violence against women during the recent armed conflicts in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, and, afterwards in Rwanda and Haiti, and in particular the rape of women used as a means of terror, intimidation, and as a tool of war, have shaken public opinion. Unfortunately the disclosures and testimonies by women victims of such violence, most of them from Bosnia and Herzegovina, have been only recently, and to a limited extent, followed by proper legal inquiry by the United Nations Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda. The disclosure of war-related violence against women, however, in particular in the former Yugoslavia, has brought worldwide visibility and attention to these matters." (Gierycz,1997:114)

The City University of New York School of Law sponsors the International Women's Human Rights Law Clinic, which has undertaken projects involving violence against women and challenges to rape as a political weapon in the former Yugoslavia.(Andreopoulos and

Claude,1997:256)

Education about peace and education for peace

When we try to analyze more closely the difference between the more cognitive, fact-oriented, and formal approach to peace education found in the term education **about** peace and the broader approach found in the term education **for** peace, we discover that not only do the two prepositions differ in the two juxtapositions, but so does the seemingly same word "education". Depending on the preposition, education may mean the more limited, formal learning of subject matter, acquisition of knowledge (education **about**) or the broader informal learning of attitudes, values and behaviour (education **for**). In both cases we have to do with a normative type of education, a certain subject matter which is regarded by peace educators as the best to further peace or a certain way of organizing the learning environment judged as conducive for the fostering of the peaceful person.

Both of the definitions cited earlier in this essay, the one by Betty Reardon defining the goals of peace education and my definiton defining the peace education field itself are clearly normative and they deal with the broader concept education **for** peace.

There is a normative element in <u>all</u> education. The German educator Leo Friedrich (1987) maintains that the educational process is geared at aims and follows norms which cannot be readily deduced from that what is already given. The educational process is supposed to lead to an aim which has not been fullfilled yet for the person in question.

When peace education is taken to mean education **about** peace, the definitional problems are of a different kind than when peace education is also taken to include education **for** peace.

Educating about peace in a globalized world.
When we deal with the cognitive realm of peace education, the education *about* peace, we need both to look at the possibilities for worldwide communication that are uniting people across continents in an unprecedented way and at the effects of a globalized world-economy.

Peacelinks - linking peace educators
For those who have the possibility to access the Internet there is a wealth of information that can be used in peace education. Swift communication through e-mail has led to the formation of many electronic bulletin boards within the field of peace studies.
With the availability of communication in cyber-space it is also possible to form groups consisting of individuals from all parts of the globe who are interested in peace education. The late Professor Paul Smoker at the University of Antioch and the former Secretary General of IPRA (the Intenational Peace Research Association) was a great advocate of the use of cyber-space for peace education. With the enthusiasm of a child who had discovered a new creative toy he informed us constantly of new peace groups that had found each other in cyber-space. He spoke about the way the Internet could be used for a revolution from below, connecting protesting groups all over the world.

But the Internet can also be used to spread pornography and

violence and unite neo-Nazi groups. And even though internet access is spreading rapidly to the third world, it is yet only a medium that will unite the political and intellectual elites in various countries.

What type of violence does the globalized market-economy lead to? What challenges does it pose for peace educators?

As mentioned Betty Reardon sees the general purpose of peace education as the development of authentic planetary consciousness that will enable us to function as global citizens and to transform the present human condition by changing social structures.

The globalized market-economy is changing social structures but in the opposite direction of the one adhered to by peace educators and peace researchers. Peace is by peace researchers defined as the absence of both structural or indirect and direct violence. Structural violence is a type of violence that is built into the structures of society, that is some people get poorer as an effect of others getting richer. A society where disparities are growing is developing into a more structural violent and less peaceful society. This seems to be the effects of the globalized market economy.

Among the areas included in peace education the following might become especially important when dealing with the growing structural violence the globalized economy leads to: human rights, social justice, world resources and global environment. World resources are becoming more and more unevenly distributed. As already mentioned, the ratio of the income of the top 20% to that of the poorest 20 rose from 30 to 1 in 1960 to 78 to 1 in 1994 (UNDP,1997:9)

For a peace educator it is important to make pupils and students aware of these facts, of the effects of the market economic policies. The study of the growth of inequities between countries, between some of the so-called developing countries, between these countries and the industrialized countries and also within countries must be an important part of peace education in a globalized world. Students should be helped to gather statistics from international sources, statistics on the distribution of food, calorie intake, child mortality and see them in a world perspective. They should also be helped to study their own society, the growth in differences between different parts of the country or the city they live in. How has the growth in disparities come about? What rules and regulations lead to it? Which groups have become poorer and are especially likely to be unemployed and having a hard time finding a place to live and enough food for an adequate diet?

A study of this kind, especially if it also includes the students near surroundings, will do much to inform students of the consequences of the market-economic changes that the globalized economy entails.

Education for Peace in a globalized world.
The task of the educator had been much easier had there been a clear correlation between the knowledge one is exposed to and the attitudes that develop. Such correlation is hard to find. But a certain level of knowledge is often a prerequisite for an attitude change. The UNESCO Institute of Education located in Hamburg, Germany, some years ago made a study of the attitudes towards certain social questions and knowledge about the same questions among elementary and secondary school students in several of the member states of UNESCO. In a Swedish report from the project the conclusion is drawn that there was no clear correlation between the knowledge level of the students and

their attitudes. (Samhällskunskap och samhällssyn, 1976) To raise the level of knowledge without making other changes in the classroom situation did not have any significant effect on the social attitudes and values of the school children.

A Norwegian study has shown that the fact that highly educated people in many surveys express more positive views about ethnic and other minorities than the lower educated cannot be attributed to the content of education itself. Normally the following six main types of explanations for the less racist attitudes of higly educated people have been put forward:

1. Tolerance and conception of rights are among the norms that the educators try to impart. The longer the education, the greater the chance of the students internalizing these norms

2) Education will confer knowledge, and thus break down sterotypic beliefs about immigrants

3) Long-time education will increase the cognitive competence and so make people more resistant to hostile propaganda about immigrants and more able to understand the situations of conflict

4) High education will lead to jobs with high social status, protected from direct competition with immigrants on the job and housing markets

5) High education will strengthen the general ability of mastering, this reducing the danger of situations creating conflicts and aggression

6) High education will create both motivation and ability to act opportunistically in this conflictladen matter. Highly educated people know that they are expected to demonstrate tolerance and open minds, and their knowledge and verbal aptitude will make it easy to disguise eventual hostility.

In an empirical analysis on a representative sample (n=2 048) of the Norwegian population between the ages of 16 and 74 conducted by the Norwegian researchers Anders Todal Jenssen and Heidi Engesbak (1994) explantions number four, five and six were supported. The results for the first type of explanation are, however, ambiguous and those on explanations two and three negative. It does from this analysis not look like education in itself breaks down sterotypic beliefs about immigrants or make youngsters less racist.

In his research on the effectiveness of contemporary issues curricula (in these "issues" he includes global education and also peace education which he equates with nuclear war education) James Leming (1992) has computed the ratio of achieved outcomes to desired outcomes. The ratio was computed for knowledge, attitudinal and behavioral outcomes across all the curricular areas reviewed.

It was found that, with regard to knowledge goals, the outcomes were achieved in 66.6% of the cases. (20 of 30) If the 3 of ll success rate of global education is removed, 89% of the studies remaining reported achieving knowledge-level outcomes. In 32.6% of the cases (27 of 82), desired attitudinal outcomes were achieved; in 27.5% (ll of 40) desired behavioural outcomes were achieved. If the findings of cooperative learning strategies are removed from the data on behavioural outcomes, however, the desired outcomes were achieved in only 10% of the cases (3 of 30). James Leming concludes:

"The changing of student attitudes and behaviour associated with the goals of contemporary issues curricula appears to be a much more formidable task for school curricula than the teaching of knowledge regarding those same issues. Given that no clear relationship between increased knowledge and changes in attitudes and behaviour was detected, the overall educational and social significance of the knowledge gains achieved must be questioned." (Leming,1992,p.146)

People who have through personal suffering and starvation felt what it means to be deprived will fight against oppression and for liberation with their whole soul involved and in a more emotional way than children who live in an affluent society and just read about and study the growing inequities.

A good example of a way of teaching which made the students become emotionally engaged in the question about the unjust distribution of resources in this world can be found in a Swedish book (Eriksson,a.o., 1977). In the book a story from a school in Finland is told. It happened at this school that when the secondary school students came to the cafeteria one day to get their luncheon, they were met by the smell of wonderful hamburgers. They lined up in a cue as normal to get the delicious food. The first ones who were served got plenty of hamburgers, French fries and salad, even more than they could eat. The next ones got only French fries, no hamburgers. Some few students got only some soup. When they reached the counter, the majority of students were, however, told that there was no more food, not even soup. Those students got angry, terribly annoyed. This they felt terribly unjust. Why had so much been given to the first ones in the line so that there was nothing left for those who came a little later?

Their anger led, however, to a constructive dialogue with the ones who served the food. These people had, of course, been breifed about the experiment and asked the students: Do you know how resources are distributed in our world to-day? In that world only two out of ten people may eat as much as they want. Many of these people eat more than is good for them. Most people in the world get less to eat than they need, many are starving to death. Why do you not protest against this situation when you get so angry because you were among those to-day who did not get any hamburgers? After this experience the students studied the problems of the developing countries and of structural violence with a high emotonal commitment.

The goals of educating for peace
A goal for peace education is the creation of the critical and analytical mind. Another goal would be the development of a cooperative way of working. In order to be able to solve life-threatening and global problems we need to develop an ability to cooperate. But what does normal formal schooling do to develop this ability? People are also more able to cooperate and to solve problems constructively if they have confidence in themselves and a feeling of self-security and self-worth. Again: what are the chances of a child coming out of his/her schooling experience with a secure self-concept? How can the school help children learn to cooperate and to gain self-confidence?

It is not easy to work for these goals in the normal competitive school system. Even though the goals are frequently also the proclaimed goals of formal schooling, the structures built up

around individual achievements, grading and individual competition do not further goals enhancing cooperation and self-worth.

It is difficult to teach peace in a setting where children are taught to compete against each other. It is difficult to teach about equality between states large and small when there is so little equality between teachers and pupils, to teach about the equality of the sexes when the boys in the class are allowed to dominate the girls. In a discussion of this dilemma I have elsewhere raised the question:"Is it at all possible to teach democracy in an authoritarian school or university? (Brock-Utne,1989,p.157.)

The Norwegian peace researcher and educator Johan Galtung has for many years held the belief that the normal school system is not well suited for peace education. (Galtung,1973, Galtung l975).
Discussing the dilemma of educating for peace in a competitive school setting he asks:

> "Will it not merely sound hypocritical? - or, even worse, remain empty words that are nullified through the much stronger message of verticality and dominance being normal and acceptable, conveyed through the structure itself?" (Galtung, l975, p.81.)

The Swedish peace educator Åke Bjerstedt (1986) discusses this dilemma in a book about "Learning for the Future." He finds that the self-concept, the personal sense of security and the ability of an individual to cooperate adequately are essential ingredients in peace education and in the development of what he calls the "egofuturem" (our conceptions about our ability to function in the future). He cites a couple of successful and creative men who feel that their own school-days were destructive and counterproductive. He also admits that a teacher is no magician and that there are unpeaceful structures in school that are difficult for the teacher to change. Yet he finds that the teacher must always pose her/himself the following questions:

> "Do I as a teacher do whatever I can to help my pupils gain a feeling of self-security and self-esteem? Do I do whatever I can in order for my pupils to wish to go on studying and learning? Do I do whatever I can so that they shall feel capable of handling problems and challenges in the future?" (Bjerstedt,1986,p.89, my translation)

He finds that most schools of to-day with their constant comparisons of achievements, competitions and ranking easily make many students lose all self-confidence and feeling of self-worth. They make youngsters in their most formative years feel like failures and good for nothing. The teacher must strive to counteract the hidden messages of schooling, messages devaluing the students and giving them little hope for the future, creating a low "ego-futurem". I see three ways of doing this:

l. By teaching students about the structures that are built up, for instance the relative ranking scale used by grading exams.

2. By giving students opportunity to develop their own interests and have these acknowledged in school. A teacher teaching for peace has to find traits in her/his students to praise and encourage in order to build their self-confidence.

3. By training the capacity in students to imagine a transformed

society, to describe to themselves and others what a better, more humane global order might be like.

The American peace educator Betty Reardon (1988) puts it this way:

> "Thinking about how the world might be and envisioning a society characterized by justice are the essence of conceptualizing the conditions that comprise positive peace. If we are to educate for peace, both teachers and students need to have some notion of the transformed world we are educating for." (Reardon, 1988b, p.25)

She finds that we must keep the development of this capacity paramount among our learning objectives.

Often teachers will say that if we just praise students, have them do things they like and are good at, train them in cooperation and sharing, they will fail their exams. Somehow a teacher working within the normal school system, but wanting to promote peace education, has to "double-qualify" her/his students, both qualifying them to cope with the normal curriculum - at least enough to get by at exams - and qualify them in peace education by giving them these other more valuable, but often contrasting learnings. The way the normal school system functions may be analyzed and used as a case study and illustration of structural violence, violence built into structures in compulsory schooling.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

References:

Andreopoulos,George and Richard Pierre Claude,1997:Specialized Human Rights Training for Professionals. In: Andreopoulos, George and Richard Pierre Claude.eds.(1997): *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century*.Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.pp.255-261.

Beck,Ulrich,1997: *Was ist Globalisierung?* Frankfurt am Main:Suhrkamp.

Bjerstedt, Åke, 1986: *Lära för framtid.* (Learning for the Future) Stockholm: Liber Utbildningsförlaget.

Boulding,Elise,1978: Las Mujeres y la Violencia Social. In: *Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales.* 30:4. Paris: UNESCO.

Bradshaw,York and Michael Wallace,1996: *Global Inequalities.* Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press

Brecher,Jeremy and Tim Costello, 1994: *Global Village -Economic Reconstruction from the Bottom Up - or Global Pillage.* Boston:South End Press.

Brock-Utne,Birgit,l985: *Educating for Peace. A Feminist Perspective.*
New York/Oxford/Toronto/Sydney/Paris/Frankfurt: Pergamon Press. l75.-
pp. Reprinted in l987 and in l989. A Korean edition appeared in l986.
Published in Seoul.3l5 pp. A Norwegian edition appeared in l987. Oslo:
Folkereisning mot krig.206.pp. An Italian edition appeared at the end
of l989, published by Edizione Gruppo Abele.

Brock-Utne, Birgit. Feminist perspectives on peace and peace research.
PRIO-report.17/86. l986.

Brock-Utne,Birgit, l988: Disarmament Education: The European
Evolution. In: Ray,Douglas(ed): *Peace Education - Canadian and
International Perspectives*. London Canada: Third Eye. pp.112 - 129.

Brock-Utne,Birgit, l989: *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace
Education.* NewYork/Oxford/Toronto/Sydney/Paris/Bejing/Frankfurt:
Pergamon Press.200 pp.

Brock-Utne, Birgit, 1988b: "The Development of Peace and
Peace Education Concepts Through Three UN Women Decade Conferences."
In Alger,Chadwick and Michael Stohl (eds):
*A Just Peace Through Transformation.*Boulder,Colorado and
London: Westview Press.l988 b.pp.l70-l90.

Brock-Utne,Birgit,1994: Reflections of a cultural commuter. In:
Bystydzienski, Jill and Estelle Resnik (eds), 1994: *Women in Cross-
Cultural Transitions.* Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational
Foundation.pp.121-132.

Brock-Utne,Birgit,1997: Linking the Micro and Macro in Peace and
Development studies.In:Turpin, Jennifer and Lester R.
Kurtz,(eds),1997: *The Web of Violence.* Chicago: University of Illinois
Press.pp.149-161

Brock-Utne,Birgit,1998: Multicultural education and Development
Education. The Challenges to Peace Education. In: James Calleja and
Angela Perucca (eds.): *Peace Education: Contexts and Values.* Leece:
Pensa MultiMedia.

Brownmiller,Susan,1975: *Against Our Will: Men,Women and Rape.* New
York: Simon and Schuster.

Eisler, Riane, 1997: Human Rights and Violence. In:Turpin, Jennifer
and Lester R.Kurtz,(eds),1997: *The Web of Violence.* Chicago:
University of Illinois Press.pp.161-187.

Eriksson,Lars, Martin Fogelberg, Göran Jonsson, Harald Lundberg and
Per-Åke Wahlström,1977: *Välj värld! Det brådskar med en ny ekonomisk
världsordning.* (Choose what world you want to live in. The urgency of
a new economic order) Täby:Larson.

Friedrich,Leo,1987: Pedagogikkfaget - mellom det empiriske og det
normative. (Education - a field of study caught between the empirical
and the normative) In: Evenshaug/Harbo/Stålsett (ed): *Pedagogikk og
lærerutdanning.* (Education and teacher training) Oslo:Tano. pp.29 -
43.

Galtung,Johan, l973: Abbau struktureller Gewalt als Aufgabe der
Friedenserziehung. In: Wulf,C.: *Friedenserziehung in der Diskussion.*
Munchen. pp.22-24

Galtung,Johan, l975: Peace Education: Problems and Conflicts. In:Haavelsrud, Magnus, l975(ed.): *Education for Peace, Reflection and Action.* Guilford: IPC Science and Technology Press.pp.80-87.

Gierycs, Dorota,1997: Education on the Human Rights of Women as a vehicle for Change. In: Andreopoulos,George and Richard Pierre Claude.eds.(1997): *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century.*Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.pp.96-119.

Hannertz, Ulf 1996: *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places.* London:Routledge

Jenssen. Anders Todal and Heidi Engesbak, 1994: The Many Faces of Education: why are people with lower education more hostile towards immigrants than people with higher education? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research.* Vol.38. No.1. pp.33-50.

Leming, James, 1992: The Influence of Contemporary Issues Curricula on School-Aged Youth. *Review of Research in Education.* Vol.18. pp.111-161.

Martin, Hans-Peter and Harald Schumann, 1996: *Die Globalisierungsfalle. Der Angriff auf Demokratie und Wohlstand.* Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Piertse,J.N.,1995: Globalization as Hybridization. In: Featherstone,M.el.(eds.),1995: *Global Modernities.* London: Sage Publications.

Reardon,Betty, 1988: *Educating for global responsibility: Teacher designed curricula for peace education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon,Betty,1997: Human Rights as Education for Peace. In: Andreopoulos,George and Richard Pierre Claude.eds.(1997): *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.pp.21-35.

Samhällskunskap och samhällssyn. En internationell studie. (Knowledge about and attitudes to social questions. An international study) 1976. Skolöverstyrelsen. Stockholm: Utbildningsförlaget.

Skinningsrud,Tone,1982: Education for equality - the similarity in strategies for eliminating class, gender and ethnic differences in education. *Tidskrift för Nordisk Förening för Pedagogisk Forskning.* No.1/2.pp.14-19.

UNDP,1997: Human Development Report.